UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,217	02/27/2002	Sunit B. Mangalvedhekar	014208.1482 (05-01-011)	6980

46629	7590	03/01/2005

BAKER BOTTS, LLP
2001 ROSS AVENUE, 6TH FLOOR
DALLAS, TX 75201

EXAMINER
COBY, FRANTZ

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2161	

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/085,217	MANGALVEDHEKAR, SUNIT B.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Frantz Coby	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 September 2004</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

This is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on September 29, 2004 in which

claims 1, 9, 11, 12, 15, 25 were amended.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-32 are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on the aforementioned date have been fully

considered but they are not persuasive. The rejection of claims 1-32 mailed on June 29,

2004 remains.

The rejection follows:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 , 16, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Meske et al. U.S. Patent no. 5,530,852.

As per claims 1, 25 Meske et al. disclose "a method for preparing files for storage

in a server comprising: generating a profile for a selected file, the profile identifying at

least one associated file to be accessed by the selected file (Col. 6, line 38-Col. 7, line

29), and transmitting, to a server, the selected file, the profile, and the at least one

associated file" (See Meske et al. Figures 1-2; Col. 2, line 20-Col. 3, line 9).

As per claim 16, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the

rejection of claim 1 above. Notice that generating a file and transmitting a file has been

discussed above. In addition, Meske et al. disclose the claimed limitations of "for each

level of the descendent files, generating a profile for each descendent file in the level,

the profile identifying all of the descendent files that are immediately associated with the

descendent file as immediately associated with the descendent file" (See Meske et al.

Figures 6A-6B; Col. 6, line52-Col. 7,line 29).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-15, 17-24, 26-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Meske et al. U.S. Patent no. 5,530,852 in view of Siefert U.S. Patent

no. 5,721,906.

As per claim 2, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above.

It is noted, however, Meske et al. did not specifically detail the claimed feature of "after transmitting the selected file, the profile, and the at least one associated file, initiating downloading of the selected file from the server; identifying the at least one associated file by examining the profile', and in response to identifying the at least one associated file by examining the profile, initiating downloading of the at least one associated file from the server" downloading resources (See Siefert Col. 4, lines 15-45, Col. 15, lines 31-40., Col. 11, lines 10-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Meske et al. wherein the client server system provided thereof (See Meske et al. Figures 1-2) would have incorporated the method of downloading files as taught by Siefert. The motivation being to permit management of resources

As per claim 3, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, both Meske et al. and Seifert disclose "wherein the profile identifies the at least one associated file using a Uniform Resource Locator" because of their being in the Internet environment (See Meske et al. Figure 4., See Seifert Figures 1A-1E).

As per claims 4-6, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Siefert disclose the claimed features of "associating a globally unique identifier with each of the files, wherein the profile additionally identifies the at least one associated file by the respective globally unique identifiers"; " after transmitting the selected file, the profile, and the at least one associated file, determining if any of the at least one associated file is a missing file, wherein the missing file is any of the at least one associated file that has a different identifier than the identifier used by the profile to identify the at least one associated file; and searching, using a globally unique identifier associated with each of the at least one associated file, for the missing file; "determining the different identifier of the missing file, and updating the profile with the different identifier for the missing file" (see Siefert et al. Figures 1A-1E).

As per claim 7, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Meske et al. disclose "receiving, at the server, the selected file, the profile, and the at least one associated file; and indexing, at the server by a document manager residing in the server, the profile" (See Meske et al. Figures 6A-6B', Col. 6, lines5-col. 7,line 29).

As per claim 8, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 2 above. In addition, Siefert discloses storing the at least one

associated file in a memory associated with a client under a local identifier" (See Siefert

col. 23, lines 14-23', col.5, lines 30-36).

As per claim 9, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of

claims 1-2. It is therefore rejected as set forth above.

As per claim 10, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the

rejection of claim 9 above. In addition, both Meske et al. and Siefert disclose "wherein

the profile identifies file at least one associated file using a Uniform Resource Locator"

because of their being in the Internet environment (See Meske et al. Figure 4', See

Seifert Figures 1A-1E).

As per claims 11-13, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in

the rejection of claim 9 above. In addition, Meske et al. disclose the claimed features of

"associating a globally unique identifier with each of the files, wherein the profile

additionally identifies the at least oh/ associate file by the respective globally unique

identifiers; " after transmitting the selected file, the profile, and the at least one

associated file, determining if any of the at least one associated file is a missing file,

wherein the missing file is any of the at least one associated file that has a different

identifier than the identifier used by the profile to identify the at least one associated file;

and searching, using a globally unique identifier associated with each of the at least one

associated file, for the missing file', determining the different identifier of the missing file,

and updating the profile with the different identifier for the missing file" (see Meske et al.
Figures 1A-1E).

As per claim 14, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the
rejection of claim 9 above. In addition, Meske et al. disclose "receiving, at the server,
the selected file, the profile, and the at least one associated file'. and indexing, at the
server by a document manager residing in the server, the profile" (See Meske et al.
(See Meske et al. Figures 6A-6B; Col. 6, line52-Col. 7,line 29).

As per claim 15, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the
rejection of claim 9 above. In addition, Seifert disclose "storing the at least one
associated file in a memory associated with a client under a local identifier" (See Seifert
col. 23, lines 14-23', col.5, lines 30-36).

As per claims 17-24, 26-32, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in
the rejection of claims 318, 9-15, 16 and 25. They are therefore rejected as set forth
above.

Remarks

The Applicant argued, "Meske does not teach or suggest generating a profile for
a selected file, the profile identifying at least one associated file to be accessed by the
selected file". However, the Examiner disagrees with the preceding argument because
the system of Meske is clear and it discloses the aforementioned claimed feature in

three steps (See Meske, Jr. et al. Abstract). First, Meske disclose that a file is received

for the purpose of identifying content information. Second, information is parsed to

generate a list of profile and corresponding topics for each list of profile. From that, one

should note that the claimed feature of generating a profile for a selected file is

achieved. Third, as to the claimed feature of the profile identifying at least one

associated file, Meske is clear that information is parsed to generate not only, a list of

file, but also, corresponding topic for each profile. Therefore the corresponding topics

are the associated file to be accessed.

The Applicant also agued, "nothing in Meske teaches or suggests that its profile

identifies files to be accessed by a selected file for which the profile was generated".

The Examiner disagrees with this line of argument because Meske is clear on providing

a method for extracting profiles, generating files that contain profiles and topics

(associated files) for used in accessing data described by the profile (See Meske Title).

Further, to support Meske's intention of accessing data, Meske provides mechanisms

for retrieving information containing a list of profiles and corresponding topic for each of

the list of profiles (See Meske Col. 2, lines 56-61). Therefore, Meske does suggest

generating a profile for a selected file, the profile identifying at least one associated file

to be accessed by the selected file.

Applicant argument that, "Meske does not teach or suggest transmitting to a

server the selected file the profile and the associated file" is disagreed with by the

Examiner, because the client server shown in Figures 1-2 serves the purpose of transmitting data (file the profile and the associated file) between the client and the server.

Further, the Applicant argued, "Meske does not teach or suggest "generating a profile for the parent file identifying all of the descendent files that are immediately associated with the parent file as immediately associated with the parent file". The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's contention of such because as explained above Meske discloses generating a profile for a selected file, the profile identifying at least one associated file to be accessed by the selected file. In addition, Meske has shown in Figures 6a-6b that files format include parent file, which are also identified where a profile for the parent file is generated.

Last, the Applicant argued, "Siefert does not teach downloading of selected file from the server. However, the Examiner disagrees because it is clear that Siefert provides a mechanism for downloading resources (See Siefert Col. 4, lines 15-45; Col. 15, lines 31-40; and Col. 11, lines 10-57). Specifically, Siefert discloses that resources are located at geographically diverse sites. The invention contains a descriptive profile for each resource, and allows any user to search all profiles, and to search the profiles according to "fields" (a database term), such as by location of the resources, or by category of the resources. The user can order delivery of a selected resource, and the

system causes delivery of the resource to be executed, irrespective of the form (eg,

physical object) of the resource.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Frantz Coby whose telephone number is 571 272 4017.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Saturday 3:00PM-10:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571 272 4023. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Frantz Coby
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2161

February 21, 2005